DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 767 CG 017 936

AUTHOR Lewis, Ralph L.
TITLE Classroom Reading and Assessment: Bridging the Gap.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists (16th, Philadelphia, PA, April 18-21, 1984).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basal Reading; Classroom Techniques; Counselor Role; Elementary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Informal Assessment; *Reading Diagnosis; Reading Difficulties; Reading Processes; *School Psychologists

ABSTRACT

This document discusses basic knowledge about the reading process, in order to help school psychologists make effective recommendations for educational programming. The paper begins by identifying and describing three models of the reading process, a traditional "bottom-up" model, a more emergent "top-down" view, and an interactive model which combines the two approaches. Next, features of classroom reading instruction are reviewed. The basal program of reading is described, and an eight-step approach for using this type of program is outlined. The discussion then takes up evaluation techniques that link reading to instruction. Informal diagnostic procedures are considered in detail including teacher conferences, classroom observation, informal reading inventories, cloze (selective or random deletions of words in a passage), word lists, phonics inventories, checklists, and student interview data. Finally, the role of the school psychologist in helping to assess children with reading difficulties is discussed. (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED252767

Classroom Reading and Assessment: Bridging the Gap

Ralph L. Lewis

Kent Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ralph L. Lewis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Philadelphia Pennsylvania, April 1984.

CG 017936

Abstract

Reading difficulties are among the leading reasons for referral to school psychologists. Although not primary service providers in reading, in order to make effective recommendations psychologists nevertheless need a foundational knowledge concerning the reading process. Top-down, bottom-up, and interactional models can be helpful in conceptualizing the various types of reading approaches; however, a first-hand familiarity with basal programs is also critical. Such approaches are used in 80 to 95 percent of elementary classrooms.

Norm-referenced reading tests perform a valuable screening function and provide program eligibility information, but a variety of informal techniques is needed to provide effective programming. Given the proper guidelines, teacher conferences and classroom observations become a vital source of information. Informal reading inventories, when properly selected (or constructed), not only shed light on placement level within the classroom, but afford the discerning user insights concerning reader strategies. However, a number of qualifications and practical considerations need to be grasped. In addition to cloze procedures and carefully-selected word lists, phonics inventories, student interview data, and reading checklists fill assessment gaps with qualitative data. When used alongside information from other professionals, more instructionally-relevant decisions can be made.

Classroom Reading and Assessment: Bridging the Gap

Although school psychologists are often perceived as specialists in childhood learning problems, they typically lack extensive training in the area of reading. Yet reading difficulties are among the leading reasons for referral to school psychologists (Nickolson, 1967). To effectively deal with such referrals, the school psychologist must be able to go beyond the identification and classification of reading disorders; effective diagnosis should also lead to more effective educational programming. Such diagnosis should be based on a thorough knowledge of the reading process, and on evaluation techniques that are time-efficient, yet related to classroom demands.

Psychologists are not typically primary service providers in reading. But they can make valuable contributions to the resolution of reading difficulties by "facilitating a critical analysis of the problem, sharing current findings of reading research, and brainstorming and aiding in the design of instructional reading interventions" (Elliott & Piersel , 1982, p. 219). Such an approach not only borrows from Miller's (1978) view of the school psychologist as a knowledge-linker (linking current research to practice); it is also in keeping with Barclay's (1971) notion of the school psychologist as an expert in the area of classroom

learning. Psychologists who remain divorced from daily classroom practices are likely to lack credibility when making recommendations.

An active involvement in reading and its assessment in no way presupposes the psychologist to be the expert in reading problems. Classroom teachers, speech therapists, learning disabilities teachers, and remedial reading specialists are all important contributors. Reading specialists, in particular, play a critical role, and the school psychologist should have a thorough knowledge of their role and function. When getting to know reading specialists, factors to investigate include time spent in diagnostic work, time devoted to remedial activities, amount of teacher consultation, criteria used to qualify students for remedial assistance, organization and content of remedial activities, and assessment instruments typically utilized. Upon establishment of a close working relationship, the psychologist and reading specialist should be able to cross-validate and extend one another's findings.

The remainder of this paper will assist the psychologist in answering the following questions:

1. What is the nature of the reading process?

2. What are important features of classroom reading instruction?

3. What are evaluation techniques that can effectively link reading to instruction?

The Reading Process

A prerequisite to effective intervention is a solid background as to what constitutes the reading process. An overview is provided in this section, with the following resources recommended for further study: The Psychology of Reading, by Gibson and Levin; Volume 11 of the School Psychology Review (devoted to "Reading: Assessment and Intervention"); and the article by Roser and Schallert (1983), which appears in Advances in School Psychology, Volume 3.

Although a great deal of research in reading has been conducted since the time of Edmund Huey and Edward Thorndike (early in this century), no consensus exists as to the exact nature of reading--or for that matter, as to definition. Nevertheless, progress has been noted amidst controversy, and Chall and Stahl (1982) summarize pertinent research trends. They note a shift in concern from perceptual to language functions, as well as an increased interest in the relationship between reading and writing.

Alongside these trends, a broad view of the field identifies at least three models of the reading process. A fairly traditional, "bottom-up" reading model has the reader progressing up a skills hierarchy. This ladder builds on oral language, and extends upward to include letter-sound associations and paragraph comprehension (with

many rungs in between). Many standardized tests and phonics programs are built on this model, and psychologists who have spent any time writing IEPs are likely to be familiar with this approach. However, a more emergent view has "top-down" processing as its key feature. Psycholinguistics and a search for meaning are viewed as the reader's proper starting point. Whereas language experience lessons represent a long-standing practice consonant with this reading model, perusal of current issues of The Reading Teacher reveals many articles pertaining to story grammars, semantic webbing, predictive stories, and other strategies deriving from the top-down model. To what extent such approaches become influential in the classroom remains to be seen. In the meantime, psychologists lacking familiarity with this model can be assisted by texts such as Smith's (1971) Understanding Reading. The Test of Reading Comprehension by Brown, Hammill, and Wiederholt is among the few tests to fully incorporate this model, although Goodman and Burkes' (1972) Reading Miscue Inventory and certain informal reading inventories are closely alligned with the psycholinguistic viewpoint.

Rumelhart (1977) has combined the bottom-up and top-down models into an interactive model which would seem to offer a flexible and comprehensive framework for assessing reading performance. Following from the work of Chall (1979) and LaBerge and Samuels (1974), phonetic analysis and automatic

word recognition would seem more critical in the early stages of reading, with contextual and other top-down strategies later assuming preeminence. A knowledge of such reading processes and models not only serves as a framework for assessment, but helps clarify the conceptual bias that underlie the many forms of reading instruction. Also, upon scrutiny, reading tests will be found to reflect various conceptualizations of reading, and should not in themselves guide assessment. Instead, test selection should result from a good understanding of how children learn to read in school.

Classroom Instruction

Harris and Harris (1982) conceptualize reading instruction under either (a) language experience approaches, which involve children dictating and reading their own stories; (b) individualized, or free-choice, approaches; (c) step-by-step programmed learning approaches, where students work through carefully sequenced materials at their own rate; or (d) basal reading approaches. Basal reading approaches emerged in the United States in the late 1700s (Heathington, 1979), and are probably used in 80 to 95 percent of elementary classrooms (Aukerman, 1981; Roser & Schallert, 1983).

Since they form the backbone of reading instruction in so many classrooms, basal approaches are singled out for

further explication. Teachers frequently comment to the effect that Tommy has been unable to progress through the second pre-primer; or that Susie is in the fourth grade, but is unable to keep up with the Spinners' group, the lowest basal reader used by the class. Psychologists who lack a knowledge of the materials and skills to which a student is exposed are unlikely to provide pertinent assessments.

Basal programs are usually designed so as to gradually increase vocabulary and sentence complexity as students progress through a series of readers and workbooks. Although good literature and natural language patterns have become more prevalent, controlled vocabularies continue to characterize basal programs. Classrooms are typically divided into three (sometimes four) reading groups; as the teacher meets with one group, others in the class are engaged in seatwork. At the outset of each group meeting (which may occur each day for 30 minutes), the teacher builds story interest, discusses basic concepts, and introduces new vocabulary words. This is followed by segments of guided reading, with skill development activities designed as a lead-in to independent workbook assignments. This instructional sequence--referred to as the Directed Reading Activity (DRA)--is central, and teachers' manuals provide an extensive body of lesson activities. Additional support is provided by tests that place students at the proper program level, and regularly monitor student progress.

School psychologists who work with school systems that utilize basal programs should consider the following steps:

1. Be familiar with the excellent introduction to basal programs as provided by Aukerman's (1981) text, The Basal Reader Approach to Reading. Fifteen of the leading basal series are discussed with respect to program materials, instructional design, literary and graphic art components, and assessment packages. Numerous excerpts and some evaluative statements are also provided.

2. Review readers and workbooks firsthand, not only looking for prerequisite skills and vocabulary, but also examining literary merit, illustrations, and overall attractiveness from a child's viewpoint.

3. Focus particularly on that part of the administrator's or teacher's guide that explains the underlying conceptualization of reading, and the program rationale. Then examine the teacher's manual for a detailed look at some actual lesson plans.

4. Observe reading groups in various classrooms to see the reading program in action. This can often be combined with child study observations.

5. Talk to students about their reading experiences, why they are doing worksheets, and what they like (or do not like) about reading.

6. Carefully examine the program's scope and sequence

charts in order to understand the progression of skills to which students are exposed. Be attentive not only to word recognition and phonetic analysis strands, but to the comprehension and literary skills which the series purports to teach. Compare comprehension skills to classification systems such as those outlined by Dupuis and Askov (1982).

7. Ask your reading specialist to provide samples of basal tests as used by teachers and reading specialists. Note the criterion level for mastery, the number of test items per identified skill, and the method of assessing skills. Examine the quality of item distractors, and consider reliability factors. Compare any informal reading inventories with conventional IRIs in terms of content, design, and the role assigned to oral reading.

8. Talk to teachers about their impressions of the reading program--how it compares to previous programs in terms of difficulty level, interest, and ease of use. Discover whether the underlying rationale is at variance with the teacher's view of reading; or whether the program stifles creativity.

Basal programs are often multimillion dollar enterprises (on the part of companies), and at first glance the array of materials may seem a bit overwhelming. Casual perusal of the series will not suffice; guided inquiry and a reasonable time expenditure is necessary.

Evaluation Techniques

The position taken by this paper is that many of the norm-referenced reading tests are insufficient, by themselves, to contribute information toward instructional planning. Table 1 provides a cursory listing of skill areas subject to assessment. Exploring some of the commonly-administered tests along these dimensions, the blank spaces indicate potential gaps in assessment. For example, Johnson and Barrett (1981) examined teacher manuals and scope and sequence charts from four leading basal programs, and concluded that the greatest emphasis in comprehension had been placed on: (a) main ideas and details, (b) comparisons, (c) causal relations, (d) sequence, (e) fact and opinion, (f) the author's craft, (g) study skills, and (h) literary form. While no single test is expected to reliably measure all of these skills, few of the tests listed in Table 1 go beyond the immediate recall for textually explicit story detail. The investigation of decoding is often lacking, as well.

Insert Table 1 about here

A separate concern pertains to the ability of a norm-referenced test to indicate a student's grade level placement for instructional purposes. Recent studies (Bristow,

Pikulski, & Pelossi, 1983; Pikulski & Shanahan, 1982) report that when basal reader placement is used as a validating criterion, the commonly used Wide Range Achievement Test grossly overestimates reading level. The content and design of many standardized reading tests vary considerably from what is expected of students in the classroom; therefore, this finding should perhaps not be surprising. But Johns (1982) suggests that many students are placed in books that are too difficult for them, thus highlighting the need for accurate indices of instructional reading level.

Standardized, norm-referenced tests may offer important contributions toward screening and the establishment of discrepancies between ability and achievement. However, informal diagnostic procedures are often necessary to: (a) further study and evaluate reader behavior, (b) monitor student progress, and (c) supplement and confirm data from norm-referenced measures (Johns, 1982).

Teacher Conferences

Teacher conferences can produce a wealth of information when the following points are addressed:

1. Ask to see any tests given by the classroom teacher or reading specialist, to include end-of-unit and other basal tests. Selective collection of student worksheets can also be enlightening.

2. Discover the basis on which students are placed in

reading groups, along with the system for establishing reading groups.

3. When appropriate, talk about the teacher's view of reading, skills stressed in the classroom, and the types of reading activities that are prevalent.

4. Be attentive to any incentives offered for good performance, as well as means for determining student progress.

5. Note the pace of reading instruction (amount of material covered per session).

6. Note the extent to which reading transcends basal instruction.

7. Be sensitive to students that have recently transferred from another school system, and who have not been afforded a good transition into a different reading series.

Such discussion points not only provide good assessment or pre-assessment data, but can provide the teacher with "food for thought" regarding reader placement and instructional strategies.

Classroom Observation

Student observation during reading instruction can substantiate and extend information obtained during the teacher conference. The psychologist may wish to pay particular attention to student time-on-task, distractions that may affect performance during reading group, methods of preparation for reading (e.g. background concepts), type and level

of questions posed by the teacher, degree of student interaction, type and level of questions asked by students, and the nature of corrective feedback that the teacher gives to students.

Considerable flexibility is available in the use of Directed Reading Activities (DRAs), and some teachers may make use of variant strategies, such as the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (Stauffer, 1975). Observation is to a great extent knowing what to look for, and the amount of information obtained will increase as the psychologist becomes more knowledgeable about reading and the varied approaches to reading instruction.

Informal Reading Inventories

Informal reading inventories (IRIs) consist of a series of graded paragraphs that usually range from 50 to 200 words each. A student is asked to read orally, errors are recorded, and a series of comprehension questions is asked. Alternate passages for silent reading comprehension and listening comprehension may also be available. Graded word lists may be used to ascertain a student's starting point within the passages, although the validity of this procedure has been seriously questioned (McKeena, 1983). In addition to shedding light on word recognition (in context) strategies, the combination of oral reading accuracy and comprehension is often used to determine grade levels for a student's independent, instructional, and frustration levels.

For example, using the original Betts (1946) guidelines, a student's instructional level would be represented by that passage where oral accuracy was 95 to 99 percent, and comprehension was in the range of 75 to 90 percent.

Informal reading inventories are of several varieties: (a) examiner constructed, (b) commercially packaged, and (c) those which are a part of basal reading programs (and are sometimes used by reading specialists). Even the commercially developed IRIs have been criticized for their lack of established reliabilities (including inter-rater, test-retest, and alternate forms), for comprehension questions that lack passage dependency (that could be answered based on prior knowledge), and due to serious questions as to what constitutes an error (or miscue). Further controversy surrounds the percentages used to determine the three reading levels, with suggestions that the original ranges were set too high (McKeena, 1983). These problems are only compounded when one is asked to construct an informal reading inventory based on classroom texts. Passages selected from various parts of the same book are likely to vary in readability, necessitating the use of a readability formula; also, important decisions will need to be made regarding the construction of comprehension questions.

The above critique is meant not to discourage, but rather to humble the serious IRI-user. Psychologists should also be aware that the IRIs that accompany basal series are frequently

designed for children to first read silently, then orally, as is typical of classroom reading.

Available research suggests a good correspondence between teacher-constructed and commercially-available IRIs when similar error criteria are utilized, and such IRIs would seem to be good predictors of basal reader placement (Bristow, Pikulski, & Pelosi, 1983; Pikulski & Shanahan, 1982). One possible exception is that for the beginning reader (first reader or below) the commercial IRIs may produce a lower estimate of instructional level than does a program-based IRI (Pikulski & Shanahan, 1982). Given these findings, it would seem likely that the time-conscious school psychologist would generally opt for one of the eleven commercially-produced IRIs reviewed by Jongsma and Jongsma (1981).

Certain practical considerations are in order when using an IRI. Audio taping can be particularly helpful to the neophyte, and even the experienced IRI user can focus more on the student and less on the verbatim recording of errors. Scoring conventions used to mark the protocol are presented in Elliott and Piersel (1982), and further guidelines for IRI construction are presented in Stauffer, Abrams, and Pikulski (1978). When greater proficiency is attained, comprehension may be checked by a retelling strategy, having students tell as much of the story as they can remember, then posing only those questions which were not addressed in

the retelling. Finally, error analysis results may not only be at variance with errors or words pronounced in isolation, but may shift in type when testing proceeds from instructional to frustration levels (Pikulski & Shanahan, 1982). Therefore, when making recommendations for instruction based on an error analysis, data derived from reading samples at the instructional level(s) may have more validity (as they more closely match classroom demands). The timing of passages at the instructional level is also recommended for establishing reading rates.

Cloze

Although cloze procedures (selective or random deletions of words in a passage) are sometimes used as a form of instruction, cloze procedures have also been used extensively as a diagnostic tool. Both in terms of design and administration, cloze contrasts considerably with IRIs; but cloze procedures can also provide a good complement to the other--more diagnostic--procedures.

Unlike readability formulae, cloze can be more sensitive to factors such as unusual word meanings, symbolic language, confusing sentence structure, and reader background (Pikulski & Tobin, 1982). Randomly deleting 50 words from a 250 to 300-word passage, exact-word replacement scores of at least 50 percent can be thought of as representing the independent reading level (no teacher guidance necessary); likewise, scores between 30 and 50 percent are considered to represent

the instructional level, with scores below 30 percent representing frustration level.

One advantage of cloze procedures is their ease of construction and susceptibility to group administration (or individual student completion in the classroom). Such procedures can be particularly useful for evaluating the appropriateness of a content area textbook for a disabled reader. If an alternate text cannot be used, then cloze procadures can indicate when vocabulary and concept building might be prerequisite to the completion of reading assignments. A complete discussion of cloze and its variations can be found in Pikulski and Tobin (1982). As these authors point out, many unanswered questions surround the use of cloze, and it should be used alongside other reading comprehension measures.

Word Lists

Word lists can be used either (a) to produce a grade level estimate, (b) to investigate word recognition skills, or (c) to sample from a student's expected sight vocabulary. As mentioned elsewhere in this paper, the WRAT word list can grossly overestimate a child's instructional reading level (perhaps on the average of one out of three times), and grade levels obtained solely from word lists can be misleading.

When presenting a word list, a frequently helpful procedure is to present the word with a quick exposure (using a plain card or tachistoscope), followed by an untimed, or

analysis, exposure for the previously missed words. Good sources for word lists are the Dolch 220 words, and the updated version provided by Johnson (1971). Words may also be drawn directly from basal word lists as presented in teachers' manuals. In order to reduce evaluation time for lengthy lists, one of three solutions is available: (a) randomly sample from the list, (b) proceed in order of difficulty, starting with the easiest word and discontinuing after 10 to 12 consecutive failures; or (c) restrict reading to the brief exposure time only. Even the Dolch 220 word list can be administered in less than 8 minutes using an exposure time of 2 seconds (or less) per word. This procedure has the added advantage of identifying those words firmly within the student's sight vocabulary, as little time is available for phonetic analysis.

When performing an error analysis it is common to list the attempt alongside the actual word, and then look for error patterns. The important reminder, however, is to also juxtapose such error patterns alongside errors from context at the student's instructional level.

Phonics Inventories

Phonics tests which are frequently used are a part of the Gates-McKillop, Spache, and Brigance inventories. The typical format is to have the student pronounce the printed vowel or consonant sound in isolation, or to indicate the beginning, medial, or ending sound for a word pronounced by the examiner. Consonant substitution for word families

(might, fight) is also common. Keep in mind that on group tests the task is often receptive, and the opposite of that actually required when reading.

One way to select from the many phonics tests is to review the basal series scope and sequence chart, selecting from the pertinent sounds and phonic's rules which have been introduced. Be mindful, however, that a student unable to give a "bl" blend in isolation may nevertheless pronounce it when word or passage context is available.

Checklists

Checklists of reading difficulties can be quickly completed, and alert the examiner to the many features of a child's reading (such as phrasing, volume, and rate for oral reading). The Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty contains a well-regarded Check List of Instructional Needs, and an excellent checklist is also to be found in Harris and Sipay (1975, pp. 208-210). While such checklists provide a descriptive profile of reading components, a portion of a prescriptive checklist (as developed by James Dunn) appears in Elliott and Piersel (1982). Although Elliott and Piersel regard the remedial strategies associated with this checklist as tentative, they acknowledge this as a good source for instructional leads.

Student Interview Data

A frequently overlooked source of information about student reading habits would seem to be the child. Attitudes

and interest inventories are available (see Johns, 1982), but during individual child study much of this information should also be available through informal discussion with the child. Just as psychologists ask about friendships, family, and favorite subjects in school, it also makes sense to ask about favorite books, visits to the library, whether parents read to the child, and questions about the child's estimation of personal reading capabilities. Interest data can help accomodate certain reading activities in the direction of the child's personal involvements.

Conclusions

Too often children having reading difficulties are referred for child study, only to be evaluated extensively in areas other than reading. Just as children who read a lot are likely to improve their reading, psychologists who watch and listen to children read are more likely to contribute to successful reading interventions. Such interventions are certainly a team responsibility, but to function optimally, every member of the professional team needs some expertise with respect to reading.

As was evident from the review of informal evaluation techniques, these tests have difficulties in their own right (such as less advanced psychometric characteristics). Neither was it feasible to present all forms of informal evaluation; for example, diagnostic teaching lessons as presented by Harris and Sipay (1975) look promising, but time constraints

would seem to preclude their use by most school psychologists. However, when used alongside the more traditional test instruments, the judicious selection of informal evaluation instruments can contribute a great deal toward the formulation of instructionally-relevant decisions.

References

Aukerman, R. C. (1981). The basal reader approach to reading. New York: Wiley.

Barclay, J. R. (1971). Descriptive, theoretical, and behavioral characteristics of subdoctoral school psychologists. American Psychologist, 26, 257-280.

Betts, E. A. (1946). Foundations of reading instruction. New York: American Book Company.

Bristow, P. S., Pikulski, J. J., & Pelosi, P. S. (1983). A comparison of five levels of reading instructional level. The Reading Teacher, 37 (3), 273-279.

Chall, J. S. (1979). The great debate: Ten years later, with a modest proposal for reading stages. In L. B. Resnick & P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading (Vol. 1) (pp. 29-55). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chall, J. S., & Stahl, S. A. (1982). Reading. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research, 5th edition. New York: Free Press.

Elliott, S. N., & Piersel, W. C. (1982). Direct assessment of reading skills: An approach which links assessment to intervention. School Psychology Review, 11(3), 267-280.

Gibson, E. J., & Levin, H. L. (1975). The psychology of reading. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Goodman, Y. M., & Burke, C. L. (1972). Reading Miscue Inventory manual: Procedure for diagnosis and evaluation. New York: Macmillan.

Harris, A. J., & Sipay, E. R. (1975). How to increase reading ability, 6th edition. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Harris, J., & Harris, L. (1982). Basal reading programs and the school psychologist. School Psychology Review, 11(3), 290-298.

Heathington, B. S. (1979). Basal readers. In J. E. Alexander (Ed.), Teaching reading (pp. 254-271). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Johns, J. L. (1982). The dimensions and uses of informal reading assessment. In J. J. Pikulski & T. Shanahan (Eds.), Approaches to the informal evaluation of reading (pp. 1-11). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Johnson, D. D. (1971). The Dolch list reexamined. The Reading Teacher, 24(5), 445-457.

Johnson, D. D., & Barrett, T. C. (1981). Prose comprehension: A descriptive analysis of instructional practices. In C. M. Santa & B. L. Hayes (Eds.), Children's prose comprehension: Research and practice (pp. 72-102). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Jongsma, K. S., & Jongsma, E. A. (1981). Test review: Commercial informal reading inventories. The Reading Teacher, 34, 697-705.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 6, 293-323.

McKeena, M. C. (1983). Informal reading inventories: A review of the issues. The Reading Teacher, 36(7), 670-679.

Miller, W. E. (1978). A new role for the school psychologist--Who needs it? Psychology in the Schools, 15, 514-518.

Nicholson, C. A. (1967). A survey of referral problems in 59 Ohio school districts. Journal of School Psychology, 5(4), 280-286.

Pikulski, J. J., & Shanahan, T. (1982). Informal reading inventories: A critical analysis. In J. J. Pikulski & T. Shanahan (Eds.), Approaches to the informal evaluation of reading (pp. 94-116). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pikulski, J. J., & Tobin, A. W. (1982). The cloze procedure as an informal assessment technique. In J. J. Pikulski & T. Shanahan (Eds.), Approaches to the informal evaluation of reading (pp. 42-62). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Roser, N., & Schallert, D. L. (1983). Reading research: What it says to the school psychologist. In T. R. Kratochwill (Ed.), Advances in school psychology (Vol. 3) (pp. 237-268). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977). Toward an interactive model of reading. In S. Dornic & P. M. A. Rabbitt (Eds.), Attention and performance, VI. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Smith, F. (1971). Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stauffer, R. G. (1975). Directing the reading-thinking process. New York: Harper and Row.

Stauffer, R. G., Abrams, J. C., & Pikulski, J. J. (1978). Diagnosis correction and prevention of reading disabilities. New York: Harper and Row.

Table 1

Skills Sampled by 10 Commonly Administered Reading Tests

Tests	Word Recogn.				Comprehension				
	Decoding	Sight Recog.	Accuracy	Oral Rdg.	Silent Rdg.	Literal	Inference	Sequencing	Main Idea	Study Skills
Basic Reading Invent.		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	
Diagnostic Rdg. Scales	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Durrell Analysis	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Gates-McKillop	x	x	x	x						
Gilmore Oral		x	x	x	x	x				
Gray Oral		x	x	x						
PIAT		x	x	x	x	x				
TORC					x	x	x	x	x	
WRAT		x	x	x						
Woodcock Rdg. Mastery		x			x	x	x			